

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 19, 21-25, 27-30, 32-37, 42, 48, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pong (US 4,968,878) in view Brown (US 5,978,738).

Regarding claims 19, 22-24, Pong discloses an unmanned mobile vehicle 10 comprising a vehicle body 12, and at least two sensors (40 and others sensors) positioned on the vehicle body (figures 1-5, column 7, lines 10-30) including a light sensor 40. Because the unmanned mobile vehicle 10 is a floor cleaning machine (col. 2, lines 60-66), it is clearly seen that the unmanned mobile vehicle 10 can be used in a stable as desired by a user. Pong does not clearly disclose the sensors selected from the group consisting of a temperature sensor, an air pressure sensor (claims 19, 22, 24), a light sensor, and an air humidity sensor (claims 19, 23, 24). Brown teaches the use of a portable unmanned machine that can be used anywhere, the machine comprising at least two sensors selected from the group consisting of a temperature sensor, an air pressure sensor 58, a light sensor, and an air humidity sensor 60 (abstract, col. 7, line 40-col. 8, line 30). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the two sensors selected from the group consisting of a temperature sensor, an air pressure

sensor, a light sensor, and an air humidity sensor to the vehicle of Pong as taught by Brown for the purpose of measuring meteorological conditions within the stable.

Regarding claim 21, Pong discloses the light sensor 40 determining the intensity of light.

Regarding claim 25, Pong discloses the sensors being disposed at different levels on a carrier which is part of the vehicle (fig. 1-5).

Regarding claims 27, 30, 32-36, 42, Pong as modified by Brown discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 19, but does not disclose a data processing unit (claim 27), a memory (claim 30), alarm means (claim 32), a transmitter unit (claims 33-36), a registration unit (claims 33, 34), a control unit (claims 35, 36), a data management system, at least two of the sensor collecting data which are stored in the data management system (claim 42).

Brown further teaches the use of a data processing unit 100, a memory 102, 100, alarm means (abstract, col. 7, line 40-col. 8, line 30), a transmitter unit 132, a registration unit 100, a control unit 120, a data management system 100, 102, 120, at least two of the sensor collecting data which are stored in the data management system (abstract, col. 7, line 40-col. 8, line 30).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a data processing unit, a memory, a transmitter unit, a registration unit, a control unit, a data management system, at least two of the sensor collecting data which are stored in the data management system to the vehicle of Pong as taught by Brown for the purpose of storing data from at least two sensors,

for registering data from the sensors, for providing an alarm signal when the climate in the stable reaches a predetermined uncontrollable state, for transmitting and controlling data.

Regarding claim 28, Pong discloses a processing unit 54 for processing data from the two sensors (fig. 5).

Regarding claim 29, Pong discloses a control unit 54 for controlling data from the two sensors (fig. 5).

Regarding claim 37, Pong discloses navigation means 54.

Regarding claims 48-49, Pong discloses an unmanned mobile vehicle 10 comprising a vehicle body 12, and a detection means positioned on the body (fig. 1-5, col. 7, lines 10-30). Because the unmanned mobile vehicle 10 is a floor cleaning machine (col. 2, lines 60-66), it is clearly seen that the unmanned mobile vehicle 10 can be used in a stable as desired by a user. Pong does not clearly disclose the detection means comprising a temperature sensor for determining the climate in the stable. Brown teaches the use of detection means comprising a temperature sensor 56 for determining the climate in the stable. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the detection means comprising a temperature sensor for determining the climate in the stable to the vehicle of Pong as taught by Brown for the purpose of effectively monitoring conditions within the stable.

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pong in view of Brown as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Taylor (US 6,312,507).

Regarding claim 20, Pong as modified by Brown discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 19, but does not disclose a gas sensor which senses ammonia. Taylor teaches the use of a gas sensor which senses ammonia (col. 2, line 65- col. 3, line 8). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the sensor being a gas sensor which senses ammonia to the vehicle of Pong (modified by Brown) as taught by Taylor for the purpose of monitoring conditions within the stable.

4. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pong in view of Brown as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Hurnik (US 5,474,085).

Regarding claims 38-40, Pong as modified by Brown discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 19, but does not disclose an animal identification system (claim 38), a camera (claim 39), a radar (claim 40). Hurnik teaches the use of an animal identification system (col. 2, lines 50-59), a camera (col. 2, line 40), a radar (fig. 1). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include an animal identification system, a camera, a radar to the vehicle of Pong (modified by Brown) as taught by Hurnik for the purpose of effectively monitoring conditions within the stable.

5. Claims 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pong in view of Brown as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Pratt (US 5,008,821).

Regarding claims 43-46, Pong as modified by Brown discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 19, but does not disclose feed modification means. Pratt teaches the use of feed modification means 26 (col. 4, lines 40-58, col. 6, lines 5-22). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include feed modification means to the vehicle of Pong (modified by Brown) as taught by Pratt for the purpose of effectively modifying the quantity of feed supplied to animals in the stable when the climate in the stable changes. Regarding the temperature of four degrees in C, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to set a predetermined temperature as desired for the purpose of modifying the quantity of feed supplied to animals in the stable when temperature drops below a predetermined temperature.

6. Claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Claims 47, 50, and 51 are allowed.

Answers to Remarks

8. Applicant's arguments filed on November 12, 2008 have been fully considered.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-25, 27-30, 32-40, 42-46, and 48 and 49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26, 47, 50, and 51 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 26, 47, 50, and 51 has been withdrawn.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANH V. LA whose telephone number is (571)272-2970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (571) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ANH V. LA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612

ANH V. LA
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2612

AI
May 22, 2011